

Remarks

Claims 1-27 are currently pending in the patent application. The Office Action dated October 30, 2008 indicated that claims 15 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Edholm (US 6,449,269); and claims 1-14 and 16-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Shaffer *et al.* (US 6,125,108) in view of Truetken (US 6,493,324). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections, and further does not acquiesce to any rejection or averment in the instant Office Action unless Applicant expressly indicates otherwise.

The Office Actions of record (and the Advisory Action mailed on February 3, 2009) have erroneously interpreted the cited references, which do not teach or suggest multiple claim limitations as asserted. In short, all of the cited portions of the ‘269 reference refer to the control and/or configuration of a telephone server (*see, e.g.*, column 2:52-65), which does not provide teaching or suggestion of controlling and/or configuring an IP telephone as claimed. Relative to the Examiner’s comments in the Advisory Action, all of the call features to which the Examiner refers are those features executed at a central telephone server, and do not pertain to telephone device configuration as suggested. Moreover, the rejections of dependent claims 16-19 over the ‘108 and ‘324 references are improper because the rejection fails to provide any explanation as to how the cited references teach or suggest limitations of independent claim 15, from which claims 16-19 depend (*i.e.*, claim 15 stands rejected over the ‘269 reference).

Accordingly, the record has not established *prima facie* obviousness of all claims, and has specifically failed to cite a combination of references that teach or suggest the claimed approach for controlling “functions of selected IP telephony devices” or “configuring a plurality of IP telephony devices” (*e.g.*, as in claims 15 and 26). Applicant therefore maintains all traversals of record, and incorporates Applicant’s previously-filed response regarding the same.

In an attempt to facilitate prosecution, Applicant has included claim amendments with this Request for Continued Examination to assist the Examiner in understanding the prior erroneous interpretation of the cited references and the lack of correspondence regarding the same. Various amendments, such as those changing the term “adapted” to “programmed,” are stylistic in nature, and Applicant therefore believes that they do not

change the scope of the claims. Applicant requests that the Examiner review the claims and the above discussion, and invites the Examiner to telephone the undersigned to discuss the same.

Applicant believes that the claim amendments are generally consistent with the claims, prior to amendment, and further that the amendments are fully supported in the original specification (including the originally-filed claims). Various embodiments supporting the claims (including the amendments) may be found throughout the specification and figures as filed, including the original claims, with exemplary embodiments at page 11:3-13, 11:21-12:7 and 13:3-6 as relevant to the claims (*see, e.g.*, original claim 14).

In view of the above, Applicant believes that each of the rejections has been overcome and the application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (651) 686-6633.

Respectfully submitted,

CRAWFORD MAUNU PLLC
1150 Northland Drive, Suite 100
St. Paul, MN 55120
651/259-2300

Dated: March 2, 2009

By: 

Robert J. Crawford

Reg. No. 32,122

Eric J. Curtin, Reg. No. 47,511